

WRITTEN TESTIMONY OF Debora Goldstein in support of Senate Bill 237 AN ACT PROHIBITING THE STORAGE OR DISPOSAL OF FRACKING WASTE IN CONNECTICUT

I am a Commissioner of the Third Taxing District of the City of Norwalk, and responsible for policy of the municipal electric utility for approximately 4,000 electric customers. Though I testify as a citizen of the state of Connecticut and not on behalf of the Commission, I understand the critical infrastructure and cost concerns as relates to electricity produced using natural gas.

We must enact a ban on the storage, transport, disposal or repurposing of solid and liquid waste and discharge (or backflow) that result from the natural gas mining process known as hydraulic fracturing (commonly referred to as "fracking").

While the process itself is unlikely to ever be financially viable in Connecticut, there are economic incentives for individuals or companies that can bring the waste products to Connecticut, and we must prevent that because of the overwhelming costs to our state as a whole.

Connecticut has taken great pains to implement the Affordable Care Act to extend healthcare to its citizens. Toxic chemicals and radioactivity have created numerous instances of severe health consequences in other states. We should not be adding to the costs of the State's insurance risk pool by introducing unnecessary health risks.

Connecticut has taken a comprehensive approach to protecting its waterways, including our notable regional organization SWRPA. We should not be compounding the already complex issue of wastewater management and preservation of our coastal water management with the introduction of toxic waste chemicals and all of the risks attendant in storing and transporting them.

Connecticut, in its "Still Revolutionary" campaign, is seeking to increase tourism, attracting new business and development and to highlight for its own residents the many unique and special experiences available to us. Accepting fracking waste will ultimately undermine this campaign as the results of accepting fracking waste undermine our natural resources.

Radioactivity is associated with fracking waste. We should no more consider receiving fracking waste than we would consider storing nuclear waste from other states.

The fracking industry uses legal maneuvering to restrict constitutional rights of ordinary citizens and the regulatory powers of state and municipal governments. Companies have successfully sued individuals for defamation for speaking out about the effects of fracking on their properties in other states. They have succeeded in preventing the scientific study of the health effects of the chemicals used in the fracking process and in exempting themselves from disclosure laws using gag orders, **even when the chemicals were already known to the scientists or the municipalities in question.** Permitting this "fracking-adjacent" economic activity will permit industry to infringe upon our rights, as well.

As late as July of last year, fracking fluid was permissible for use as a de-icer or dust control on NYS roadways. Similar inventive and novel approaches for repurposing fracking waste will create a continual need to supervise and restrict these uses on a case by case basis through the legislature, unless a total ban on fracking waste is enacted.

Lastly, the cumulative effects of the sheer volume of by-product must be considered over the longer term: In 2009, the volume of fracturing flow-back and brines produced in Pennsylvania was estimated to be 9 million gallons of wastewater **per day**, and this figure was expected to increase to 19 - 20 million gallons/day in 2011. Compare this to the BP Deepwater Oil Spill, in which anywhere from 11 million to 39 million gallons **in total** were released.

Debora Goldstein
66 Osborne Avenue

Norwalk, CT 06855